REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 4-8 and 11-15 are all the claims pending in the application. In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over newly cited Kammer (U.S. Patent No. 7,356,347, hereinafter "Kammer") in view of Rune et al.(U.S. Patent No. 6,901,057, hereinafter, "Rune"). Claims 4, 6, 7, 11, 13 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kammer in view of Rune and further in view of Olkkonen et al. (Pub. No. U.S. 2005/0088980, hereinafter, "Olkkonen"). Claims 5 and 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kammer in view of Rune and further in view of Muthuswamy et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0204151, hereinafter, "Muthuswamy"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 15, the Examiner asserts that Kammer discloses all of the elements of independent claims 1, 8, and 15 except that "the device information is contained in unused portions of a frequency hop synchronization (FHS) packet used for an inquiry response message, and the unused portions of the FHS packet are an Undefined field and an AM_ADDR field", as recited in independent claim 1 and analogously recited in independent claims 8 and 15, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kammer does not teach or suggest the element "receives inquiry responses including device information from said at least one of said peripheral

devices that has received the inquiry", as recited in independent claim 1 and analogously recited in independent claims 8 and 15.

FIG. 1 of Kammer discloses only that the initiator device 20 receives the inquiry response 42a from the responding device 30. The Examiner cites column 2, lines 18-32 of Kammer as allegedly teaching the above-quoted element of the claims. However, Kammer merely teaches that the inquiry response includes each device's numerical address. However, the numerical address does not include any information regarding the type of numerical address.

On the other hand, the control unit in claim 1 of the claimed invention receives inquiry response including the device information. FIG. 6 and paragraph [54] of an exemplary embodiment of the present invention discloses that the device information includes information regarding peripheral devices (such as a computer, printer, PDA, headset, speaker, and computer + speaker).

Therefore, the device information in claims 1, 8, and 15 of the present invention differs from the numerical address of Kammer.

Additionally, referring to FIG. 7a of Kammer, the initiator device 720 of Kammer receives the inquiry response 742 including the address information 750 from the responding device 730, extracts the user-friendly name 760 corresponding to the address information 750 received using the memory cache 710, and displays it on the display device 440.

On the other hand, the inquiry response in claims 1, 8, and 15 of the present invention includes the device information. Therefore, the control unit of the present invention is capable of immediately determining the type of peripheral device using the device information included in the received inquiry response, without using the memory cache. That is, the process of identifying the name of the responding device 730 by the initiator device 720 of Kammer is

distinct from the process of identifying the type of peripheral device by the control unit of the present invention.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Kammer for at least the feature "wherein the control unit sends an inquiry to search for said connectable peripheral devices, receives inquiry responses including device information from said at least one of said peripheral devices that has received the inquiry, and provides information on said at least one of the peripheral devices that received the inquiry", as recited in independent claim 1 and analogously recited in independent claims 8 and 15.

As discussed above, the Examiner acknowledges that Kammer does not teach or suggest "the device information is contained in unused portions of a frequency hop synchronization (FHS) packet used for an inquiry response message, and the unused portions of the FHS packet are an Undefined field and an AM_ADDR field", as recited in claim 1 and analogously recited in claims 8 and 15. The Examiner thus relies on Rune to allegedly remedy this conceded deficiency. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Rune that "the device information is contained in unused portions of a frequency hop synchronization (FHS) packet used for an inquiry response message, and the unused portions of the FHS packet are an Undefined field and an AM_ADDR field.", as recited in independent claim 1 and analogously recited in independent claims 8 and 15.

The Examiner cites FIG. 4 and column 4, lines 50-67 of Rune as allegedly teaching this element of the claims. However, Rune discloses that the payload field in the FHS packet includes eleven fields, and all fields in the packet **except** the AM_ADDR field and the "Undefined" field indicate properties or parameters of the unit that sends the FHS packet.

Accordingly, Rune teaches away from the claimed invention. In the Rune system, the AM_ADDR field can be used to assign an AM_ADDR to a unit which will become a slave in a piconet, and otherwise these three bits should all be set to zero. The "Undefined" field is reserved for future use and includes two bits, which should be set to zero", and does not disclose that the device information is contained in an Undefined field.

Kammer discloses identifying the name using the memory cache, but fails to disclose that the device information is included in the inquiry response. Furthermore, Rune does not disclose that the device information is contained in an Undefined field of the inquiry response. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Kammer with the teachings of Rune to contain the device information in the undefined field of the FHS packet, which is the feature of claims 1, 8, and 15, since Rune teaches away from the disclosure of Kammer.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Rune for at least the feature "wherein the device information is contained in unused portions of a frequency hop synchronization (FHS) packet used for an inquiry response message, and the unused portions of the FHS packet are an Undefined field and an AM_ADDR field.", as recited in independent claim 1 and analogously recited in independent claims 8 and 15.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 should be allowable because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements of the claims. Claims 4-7 and 11-14 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1 and 8.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark E. Wallerson/

_____

Mark E. Wallerson
Registration No. 59,043

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 14, 2009